

REMARKS

The office action of August 1, 2005, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-5, 7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Echerer.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Echerer in view of the patent to Reber et al.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has amended claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references and particularly to the patent to Echerer, it can be seen that this patent discloses an interactive communication system for medical treatment of remotely located patients. In this system the patient has a direct consultation with the doctor except that the doctor and the

patient are not at the same location. Echerer does not disclose the presently claimed invention. In the present invention the object is to reduce the number of patients with neurological problems that the doctor has to directly see to thereby reduce the burden on the doctor while providing more efficient and better quality care for such patients.

Contrary to the system of Echerer, the presently claimed system does not require real time contact with the doctor. Instead, a storage device records video motion pictures of a patient that are recorded at preselected intervals and the recorded video motion pictures are processed to a shorter video motion picture sequence. The doctor can thus at any desired time view the processed video pictures of a number of patients in a shorter period of time than if he were seeing them in real time in person or remotely. Changes in motor function during the observation time period are particularly striking in the shortened video motion picture sequence. Correspondingly, an accurate diagnosis and treatment can be made.

Echerer does not disclose such a monitoring system. There is no time savings from the Echerer system. Echerer only provide the ability to see patients at remote locations. The video recorder

124 of Echerer only shows the entire visit with the doctor and does not change the time required by the doctor to see the patient. The CPU 22 and 102 do not undertake an image processing to obtain a shortened video motion picture sequence, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-5, 7 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Reber et al. discloses a medical communication apparatus. The Examiner combined Reber et al. with Echerer in determining that claims 8-9 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that Reber et al. adds nothing to the teachings of Echerer so as to arrive at the presently claimed invention as discussed above.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.